The reference system and not completely positive open quantum dynamics

Linta Joseph and Anil Shaji*
School of Physics, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Thiruvananthapuram, India 695016

Open quantum dynamics in a tripartite scenario including a system, its environment and a passive reference is shown to resolve several open questions regarding not completely positive (NCP) dynamical maps as valid descriptions of open quantum evolution. The steering states of the system and the environment with respect to the reference, reduced down to a dense, compact set of states of the system alone, provides a well defined domain of action for a bonafide dynamical map describing the open evolution of the system. The map is not restricted to being completely positive (CP) but it preserves the positivity of all states in its domain. NCP open dynamics corresponding to different initial configurations of the tripartite system are explored.

arXiv:1702.08718v1 [quant-ph] 28 Feb 2017

Information delocalised across multiple, identifiable, subsystems is a feature of quantum mechanics that leads to several subtle effects in the open dynamics of the individual subsystems. It seems increasingly clear that the flow of information is as important - perhaps even more so - as the flow of matter, energy and momentum in determining the dynamics of a quantum system evolving in contact with a quantum environment [1–3]. Such dynamics with low dimensional quantum systems evolving in contact with a micro or mesoscopic environment having quantum features, can be a theoretical as well as experimental test bed for the interplay between information flows and mechanics. In this Letter we consider the connection between information flows and the nature as well as domain of action of dynamical maps that describe finite time open evolution of a quantum system.

While the time evolved state of an isolated quantum system is given by a unitary transformation acting on its initial state, the corresponding transformation for an open quantum system is described by a dynamical map [4] defined from the set of density matrices to itself. The map has to to be trace preserving, hermiticity preserving and its action should be positivity preserving on the set of states it is defined on. However, a stronger condition of complete positivity [5] is often proposed as being required of the map [6–9]. The most widely accepted argument for complete positivity of the map involves the introduction of an arbitrary 'blind' and 'dead' witness system [10]. If the initial state of the system S and its environment E is a product state of the form $\rho_S \otimes \rho_E$, the reduced dynamics induced by the joint unitary evolution of S and E is CP. It turns out that in the presence of initial system-environment correlations, the reduced dynamics is not necessarily CP [11–15]. Is complete positivity really required and, if so, what kind of initial correlations between the system and environment, in general, guarantee CP reduced dynamics? A complete answer to this question is still not forthcoming [16–20].

Considering the role of the witness or reference system R - which may very well be the rest of the universe except for the system and its environment - in detail and using an information theoretic framework involving a tripartite approach in place of the usual bipartite one allowed Buscemi [21] to identify the conditions under which the reduced dynamics is CP as well as to define the domain of action of the CP dynamical map. In [21], the observation that NCP reduced dynamics may lead to violation of (classical) data and energy processing principles [22–27] is leveraged to recover CP dynamics by assuming that the quantum data processing inequality (DPI) which limits the delocalization and flow of information between R, S and E always holds. The initial state ρ_{RSE} of the tripartite configuration constitutes a short Markov chain with $I(R : E|S) = 0$, where $I(R : E|S)$ is the quantum mutual information between R and E conditioned on S. The quantum mutual information between two systems A and B in a joint quantum state ρ_{AB}, in turn, is defined as $I(A : B) \equiv S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) - S(\rho_{AB})$ where $S(\rho) = -\mathrm{tr}(\rho \log \rho)$ is the vonNeumann entropy. The mutual information quantifies all the correlations including the delocalised quantum information shared across the two systems. When $I(R : E|S) = 0$ the reduced dynamics on S induced by arbitrary unitary dynamics of the SE subsystem is always CP and the dynamics does not violate the quantum DPI. The quantum DPI is the condition, $I(R : S) \geq I(R : S')$, where $I(R : S)$ is the quantum mutual information between R and S before the open evolution of S in contact with E and $I(R : S')$ is the mutual information after. In other words, when the mutual information between R and E, conditioned on S is initially zero then the information that can be obtained about R from S can only decrease, if at all, as a result of the effect of E on S. The domain of action of the CP dynamical map is the reduced steering set of S obtained by tracing out E from the set of steering [28, 29] states of SE due to R.

Buscemi's approach [21] rephrases the question of whether the reduced dynamics of S should necessarily be CP into one that asks whether the initial RSE state forms a Markov chain and whether the quantum DPI is satisfied by the dynamics. Neither of the two assumptions are physically mandated or motivated. We show in the following and relaxing them puts into context several of the recent works attempting to understand the role of initial correlations in open system dynamics [11–20, 30]. The key observation is that the reduced set of steering states of S projected down from the tripartite RSE system provides the natural set on which the open dynamics is to be considered. This consideration applies not just for CP dynamics, as shown in [21], but for arbitrary dynamics as well which may not even be positivity preserving on states of S that lie outside this set.

The set of system-environment states that can be steered

from a given joint state ρ_{RSE} is given by:

$$\mathcal{S}_{SE}(\rho_{RSE}) := \left\{ \frac{\mathrm{Tr_R}[(\mathcal{P}_\mathrm{R} \otimes \mathbf{1}_\mathrm{S} \otimes \mathbf{1}_\mathrm{E})\rho_{RSE}]}{\mathrm{Tr}[(\mathcal{P}_R \otimes \mathbf{1}_S \otimes \mathbf{1}_E)\rho_{RSE}]} \right\} \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_R \in \mathbf{L}^+(\mathcal{H}_R)$ is the set of all positive semi definite linear operators acting on $\mathcal{H}_R$, the Hilbert space of R. A powerful method of visualising the steering states $\mathcal{S}_{SE}$ was obtained in [31] in terms of quantum steering ellipsoids. In [31], the construction of steering ellipsoids is done for bipartite systems but we can apply the same to our tripartite case also since we will be considering the steering states of the SE subsystem across the bipartite $R-SE$ split. For simplicity and clarity of the discussion we assume that the three systems R, S and E are all single qubits. The three qubit state ρ_{RSE} can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{RSE} = \frac{1}{2}\big(&\mathbb{1}_R \otimes \mathbb{1}_S \otimes \mathbb{1}_E + a_i\sigma_R^i \otimes \mathbb{1}_S \otimes \mathbb{1}_E \\ &+e_j\,\mathbb{1}_R \otimes \sigma_S^j \otimes \mathbb{1}_E + e_{3+k}\mathbb{1}_R \otimes \mathbb{1}_S \otimes \sigma_E^k \\ &+e_{6+3(j-1)+k}\,\mathbb{1}_R \otimes \sigma_S^j \otimes \sigma_E^k \\ &+T_{j,i}\sigma_R^i \otimes \sigma_S^j \otimes \mathbb{1}_k + T_{3+k,i}\sigma_R^i \otimes \mathbb{1}_S \otimes \sigma_E^k \\ &+T_{6+3(j-1)+k,i}\sigma_R^i \otimes \sigma_S^j \otimes \sigma_E^k\big)\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

with latin indices like i, j, k here, as well as in the following, running over the values $1, 2, 3$ and repeated indices summed over. The state ρ_{RSE} can be represented as a 16×4 matrix,

$$\Theta = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \vec{a}^T \\ \vec{e} & T \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3}$$

An arbitrary positive operator on R can be written as $\hat{E} = X_\mu\sigma_R^\mu/2$ with $X_0^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^3 X_i^2$, $X_0 \geq 0$ and greek indices running over the four values $0, \ldots, 3$. The steering state of SE corresponding to the application of $\hat{E}$ on R is then given by the 16×1 vector $\vec{e}^X = \Theta X$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{SE}^X = \frac{1}{4}\big(&e_0^X\,\mathbb{1}_S \otimes \mathbb{1}_E + e_j^X\sigma_S^j \otimes \mathbb{1}_E + e_{3+k}^X\mathbb{1}_S \otimes \sigma_E^k \\ &+e_{6+3(j-1)+k}^X\sigma_S^j \otimes \sigma_E^k\big).\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The steering states ρ_{SE}^X will not have unit trace unless $\vec{a} = 0$ and $X_0 = 1$. As shown in [31], for $|\vec{a}| < 1$ the SLOCC operator $(2\rho_R)^{-1/2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{SE}$, where $\rho_R = \mathrm{tr}_{SE}(\rho_{RSE})$, will transform ρ_{RSE} into a "canonical" state in the SLOCC orbit of ρ_{RSE} for which $\vec{a} = 0$ without affecting the steering states of SE. When $|\vec{a}| = 1$ no steering is possible anyway. We assume, without loss of generality, that in the following the SLOCC transformation that reduces $\vec{a}$ to the null vector has been applied and only such canonical states ρ_{RSE} are considered. With $\vec{a} = 0$ and $X(0) < 1$, application of the POVM element $\hat{E}$ on ρ_{RSE} will lead to a sub-normalised density matrix for the SE subsystem, which will then be renormalised by the denominator in Eq. (1) all of which together amounts to effectively setting X_0 to 1. In short, the steering states of SE are obtained by projecting the reference system on to states of R characterised by the Bloch vector $\vec{X} = (X_1, X_2, X_3)$, $|\vec{X}| \leq 1$. The steering states form a convex set with those states of SE obtained by projecting on to pure states of R with $|\vec{X}| = 1$ at the boundary.

We are interested in the nature and properties of the reduced dynamics induced on states of S when an arbitrary unitary transformation U is applied to the states ρ_{SE}^X in the steering set of SE. The reduced steering set of S consists of the states

$$\rho_S^X = \frac{1}{2}\big[\mathbb{1}_S + \Theta_{j,\mu}X_\mu\sigma_S^j\big]. \tag{5}$$

The central result of this Letter is that the unitary U transforms the set of steering states of S as

$$\rho_S^X \to \widetilde{\rho}_S^X = \frac{1}{2}\big[\mathbb{1}_S + \widetilde{\Theta}_{j,\mu}X_\mu\sigma_S^j\big], \tag{6}$$

where

$$\widetilde{\Theta}_{j,\mu} = u_{j0}^{l0}\Theta_{l,\mu} + u_{j0}^{0k}\Theta_{3+k,\mu} + u_{j0}^{lk}\Theta_{6+3(l-1)+k,\mu}. \tag{7}$$

The coefficients $u_{\alpha\beta}^{\mu\nu}$ are defined by the action of U on the basis set of tensor products of one qubit Pauli operators as

$$U\sigma_S^\mu \otimes \sigma_E^\nu U^\dagger = u_{\alpha,\beta}^{\mu,\nu}\sigma_S^\alpha \otimes \sigma_E^\beta.$$

Detailed proof of the main result in Eq. (6) may be found in Appendix A, but an intuitive understanding of the same is obtained by noting that the projection operators on R characterised by X commute with the unitary acting as $\mathbb{1}_R \otimes U$ on ρ_{RSE}. The transformation between the set of states of S obtained from the steering sets of SE before and after the action of U is therefore independent of X.

This result is significant because it answers a question that has lingered ever since NCP open dynamics was considered as a possibility backed by experimental evidence [13]. If the condition that the system and the environment is initially in a product state of the form $\rho_S \otimes \rho_E$, which is a necessary and sufficient condition for complete positivity of the reduced dynamics of S, is relaxed, then is there even a valid dynamical map that can be defined consistently? For the description of open quantum dynamics in terms of a map to be useful in any sense, it has to apply to a compact and dense set of states of S. It should be possible to pick a few linearly independent states from this set to do quantum process tomography [8, 32, 33] and reconstruct the dynamical map. In the presence of initial correlations between S and E it was not clear whether such a set of states exists and, if so, how to define it?

In [11], it was shown that if the initial state of SE is an entangled two qubit state, then the transformations on the states of S induced by unitary evolution of SE is NCP in general. The point transformations obtained could be elevated to the status of a dynamical map acting on a well defined, dense subset of states of S because it was positivity preserving on all states of S that were 'consistent' with the specification of the initial entanglement between S and E irrespective of the choice of unitary evolution of SE. In the present notation, this translates to the statement that once some of the coefficients $e_{6+3(j-1)+k}^X$ are fixed then the three coefficients e_j^X that define the reduced state of S cannot take all the possible values

that are allowed for a single qubit ($\sum_j (e_j^X)^2 \leq 1$) while still keeping ρ_{SE}^X positive. It was precisely on this subset of states corresponding to allowed values of e_j^X - termed the 'compatibility domain' - that the transformation was positivity preserving and it could be elevated to a dynamical map defined on this domain. However, several open questions remained. It is possible to choose $e_{6+3(j-1)+k}^X$ such that e_j^X would also be fixed. In this case only a point transformation acting on a single system state is obtained and not a map. Also for every choice of e_j^X consistent with some fixed $e_{6+3(j-1)+k}^X$, the coefficients determining the state of E, e_{3+k}^X are also automatically constrained. This would mean that the initial state of the environment would have to be chosen in a manner that depends on the state of S in order to elevate the transformation of interest to a map and there was no clear reason why this should be so.

Approaching the problem using steering states provides clear, elegant and aesthetically pleasing resolutions to these open questions and provides further insight into the nature of open quantum dynamics. An arbitrary unitary acting on any state belonging to the steering set of SE will induce a transformation that is positivity preserving on the corresponding reduced steering set on S obtained by tracing out E. Furthermore, a given unitary acting on SE steering set will induce the same transformation on all the states in the reduced set of S. The set of states on which the transformation acts is dense and compact which means that the transformation can be treated as a bonafide dynamical map with a well defined domain, mapping a set of states of S into another well defined set. Operationally this also means that one can reconstruct the map from observing the transformation occurring to a finite number of linearly independent initial states of S and using the techniques of quantum process tomography [8, 32, 33]. Since the steering set of SE from which the domain of action of the maps follows is itself derived from a *single* state of RSE, there is no longer any mystery in having the initial state of the environment dependent on the state of S. The choice of projection, $\vec{X}$ determines the states of both S and E together. Where R remains independent of S and E in ρ_{RSE} and no steering is possible, then only point transformations are defined and no dynamical map obtains.

It is worth noting here that all the preceding arguments will go through even if we relax the assumption that R, S and E are qubits. The Pauli matrices in Eqs. (2) and (4) can very well be replaced by generators of $SU(N_j)$, where N_j, $j = R, S, E$ are the dimensions of the three (finite dimensional) subsystems, and the construction will go through as such with changes only in the ranges of the indices.

For having a concrete framework for discussing the roles of the three systems in the observed dynamics it is useful to bring in the notion of a 'preparation' of the initial state of S as done in [30]. We can introduce a preparation device which, like the reference system, by definition, stays apart during the open dynamics of interest when S and E are interacting. The device interacts with the system prior to its open evolution and it may have also interacted with E during or before this time. For conceptual simplicity let us identify R and the preparation device with the caveat that if any part of a physical preparation device continues to interact with E after preparing the desired initial state of S, then that part of the device be identified as part of E and not R. In this picture, the initial SE state is of the form $\rho_S \otimes \sigma_E$, where σ_E is a constant state of E independent of the state of S, only if R and S do not interact with E during the preparation. Alternatively E can be a large 'thermal' system on which R and S have negligible effect. In this case the initial RSE state forms a short Markov chain with $I(R : E|S) = 0$ and the reduced dynamics of S is CP as in [21]. The domain of action of the map being the entire state space of S is then just the statement that a good preparation device R can *steer* S to any possible initial state. Buschemi's result [21] shows that even if S and E interact prior to the preparation of the initial state of S, then also the reduced dynamics is CP except that the domain of action of the map is restricted by the steering set of SE. Here the state of E can depend on the state of S that is prepared which is a scenario considered in [30] in the language of a preparation map. Our results show that R could very well interact with both S and E, in addition to any SE interactions, prior to the preparation and still we would obtain a dynamical map that is reconstructable using standard quantum process tomography techniques. The dynamical map in this case is NCP and it need not even be positive but it will preserve the positivity of all states of S in its well defined domain of action.

When S is a single quantum system and when we are concerned about its open dynamics over short time periods, its immediate environment is more often than not in itself microscopic or mesoscopic. The action of preparing an initial state of S not affecting the state of E in any way is an exceptional scenario in this case and in this sense so is CP reduced dynamics of the system. It is more reasonable to assume that right at the end of each preparation there is a certain amount of quantum information delocalised across S, E and R, where R is effectively the quantum parts of the preparing device and $I(R : E|S) \neq 0$. The device R, by definition, plays no further part in the joint evolution of S and E. Furthermore, in any particular realisation of the open dynamics, which, for instance, could be trials in a quantum process tomography experiment, R is projected on to particular states by those processes that put preparing devices in human readable, classical states [34] and announce that a particular preparation has been done. This last step puts the SE subsystem into one of its steering states.

To explore this delocalisation and flow of quantum information across systems and its bearing on the type of open dynamics that would be observed on S, let us consider a particular case wherein ρ_{RSE} has RS and RE entanglement. The reduced steering set of S starting from an RSE state with pairwise entanglement given by the concurrence values $\mathcal{C}_{RS} = 0.3677\,; \mathcal{C}_{RE} = 0.1102\,; \mathcal{C}_{SE} = 0$ is shown in Fig. 1. Also shown is the transformed set of states corresponding to the action of the unitary $V_{SE} = \exp[2i(\sigma_2^S \otimes$

$\sigma_2^E)]$ on the steering states of SE. The reduced dynamics in 'B-matrix' form (see Appendix B) has eigenvalues $(2.3838, 0.2288, -0.5704, -0.0422)$ indicating that the map is NCP. This can also be deduced from the fact that the map transforms the reduced steering set of S to a larger set and is therefore not contractive in nature.



FIG. 1. The reduced steering set of S obtained from that of SE generated from a tripartite RSE state with RS and RE entanglements as given by the concurrence values $\mathcal{C}_{RS} = 0.3677\,; \mathcal{C}_{RE} = 0.1102\,; \mathcal{C}_{SE} = 0$ is the ellipsoid (yellow) near the south pole of the Bloch sphere. This is the set on which the NCP dynamical map induced by unitary evolution of SE with $V_{SE} = \exp[2i(\sigma_2^S \otimes \sigma_2^E)]$ acts. The map transforms the set to the larger (pink) ellipsoid.

A unitary transformation of the form $V_{SE} = \exp[i\omega(\sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2)]$ acting on the SE states of the type given in Eq. (4) induces the following transformation on the Bloch vector components of S: $e_1^X \to e_1^X \cos(2\omega) - e_{14}^X \sin(2\omega)$, $e_2^X \to e_2^X$ and $e_3^X \to e_3^X \cos(2\omega) + e_8^X \sin(2\omega)$. Since the transformation depends only on e_8^X and e_{14}^X, we consider next a minimally parametrised RSE state that produce a nontrivial dynamical map by setting $e_1 = e_3 = P$, $e_5 = Q$, $e_8 = e_{14} = E$, $T_{2,i} = T_{5,i} = T_{8,i} = T_{14,i} = T$ and all other parameters in Eq. (2) equal to zero. Having $E = PQ$ ensures SE separability in ρ_{RSE}, while $T_{2,i}$ and $T_{5,i}$ ensure that the initial state has nonClassical correlations in the RS and RE subsystems. For this three parameter family of states $\rho_{RSE}(P, Q, T)$ with $e_8^X = e_{14}^X = PQ + T(X_1 + X_2 + X_3)$, we can systematically study the interdependence of the Markovianity of the initial tripartite state as quantified by $I(R:E|S)$, the degree of violation of the quantum DPI and the NCP nature of the reduced dynamics. The degree of violation of DPI is quantified by the difference between the mutual information between R and S before and after the joint SE evolution under V_{SE} as $\nu = \max(0, I(R:S') - I(R:S))$ and the NCP nature of the map is quantified by the *negativity* of the B matrix defined as $B_{\rm neg} = \sum_j |\lambda_j| - 2$, where λ_j are the eigenvalues of the B matrix and its trace is 2. In Fig. 2 a scatter plot of these three quantities for $\rho_{RSE}(P, Q, T)$ for all allowed values of B, C and T is shown (see Appendix B). For each such initial state the parameter ω in V_{SE} is chosen so as to maximise ν. We see that the violation of the quantum DPI is more when there is more delocalised information between R and E in the initial system indicating that this shared information can flow to S during the joint evolution of S and E. In all the cases considered, the open evolution of S is NCP but the negativity of the B matrix does not seem to have a close relationship to $I(R:E|S)$ and ν at least for the set of unitary transformations V_{SE} considered.



FIG. 2. Scatter plot of $I(R:E|S)$, the DPI violation ν and the negativity of the dynamical matrix $B_{\rm neg}$ for the minimally parameterised tripartite states $\rho_{RSE}(P, Q, T)$ corresponding to all allowed values of P, Q and T that keep the density matrix positive.

In Fig. 3 a scatter plot of the same three quantities is shown for around 70,000 randomly generated (see Appendix B) initial tripartite states with no SE entanglement and with the DPI violation maximised over 3000 instances of randomly generated two qubit unitaries. Here we see that ν is higher for higher values of $I(R:E|S)$ in the intitial state and $B_{\rm neg}$ is large when both $I(R:E|S)$ and ν have high values.



FIG. 3. Scatter plot of $I(R:E|S)$, the DPI violation ν and the negativity of the dynamical matrix $B_{\rm neg}$ for around 70,000 randomly generated states ρ_{RSE} with no initial SE entanglement. The DPI violation is maximised over 3000 random unitaries each

Acknowledgement: This work is supported in part by a grant

from the Ministry of Human Resources Development, Government of India through the FAST programme.

* shaji@iisertvm.ac.in

[1] H. P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The theory of open quantum systems* (Oxford university press, New York, 2002).
[2] S. Lloyd, "The universe as quantum computer," (2013), arXiv:1312.4455.
[3] R. S. Ingarden, A. Kossakowski, and M. Ohya, *Information Dynamics and Open Systems* (Springer Netherlands).
[4] E. C. G. Sudarshan, P. M. Mathews, and J. Rau, Phys. Rev. **121**, 920 (1961).
[5] M. D. Choi, Can. J. Math. **24**, 520 (1972).
[6] K. Kraus, Ann. Phys. **64**, 311 (1971).
[7] K. Kraus, *States, Effects and Operations: Fundamental notions of Quantum Theory*, edited by A. Bohm, J. D. Dollard, and W. H. Wooters, Lecture notes in Physics, Vol. 190 (Spring-Verlag, New York, 1983).
[8] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge university press, Cambridge, U. K., 2000).
[9] W. F. Stinespring, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **6**, 211 (1955).
[10] B. Shumacher, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 2614 (1996).
[11] T. F. Jordan, A. Shaji, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, Phys. Rev A. **70**, 052110 (2004).
[12] T. F. Jordan, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 034101 (2004).
[13] P. Pechukas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1060 (1994).
[14] P. Pechukas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3021 (1995).
[15] A. Shaji and E. C. G. Sudarshan, Phys. Lett. A. **341**, 48 (2005).
[16] A. Brodutch, A. Datta, K. Modi, Á. Rivas, and C. A. Rodríguez-Rosario, Physical Review A **87**, 042301 (2013).
[17] J. M. Dominy, A. Shabani, and D. A. Lidar, Quantum Information Processing **15**, 465 (2015).
[18] C. A. Rodriguez, K. Modi, A.-m. Kuah, A. Shaji, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **41**, 205301 (2008).
[19] A. Shabani and D. A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 100402 (2009).
[20] A. Shabani and D. A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 049901 (2016).
[21] F. Buscemi, Physical Review Letters **113**, 140502 (2014).
[22] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, and J. Piilo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 210401 (2009).
[23] A. D'Arrigo, R. Lo Franco, G. Benenti, E. Paladino, and G. Falci, Annals of Physics **350**, 211 (2014).
[24] D. Jennings and T. Rudolph, Physical Review E **81**, 061130 (2010).
[25] M. H. Partovi, Physical Review E **77**, 021110 (2008).
[26] J.-S. Xu, K. Sun, C.-F. Li, X.-Y. Xu, G.-C. Guo, E. Andersson, R. Lo Franco, and G. Compagno, Nature Communications **4** (2013).
[27] Á. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Reports on Progress in Physics **77**, 094001 (2014).
[28] H. M. Wiseman, S. J. Jones, and A. C. Doherty, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 140402 (2007).
[29] D. Cavalcanti and P. Skrzypczyk, Reports on Progress in Physics **80**, 024001 (2017).
[30] K. Modi, Scientific Reports **2** (2012).
[31] S. Jevtic, M. Pusey, D. Jennings, and T. Rudolph, Physical Review Letters **113**, 020402 (2014).
[32] I. L. Chuang and M. A. Nielsen, Journal of Modern Optics (2009).
[33] J. Yuen-Zhou, in *Ultrafast Spectroscopy* (IOP Publishing, 2014).
[34] W. H. Zurek, Reviews of Modern Physics **75**, 715 (2003).

APPENDIX A: PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

For the initial tripartite RSE state given by the matrix,

$$\Theta = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \vec{a}^T \\ \vec{e} & T \end{pmatrix},$$

the steering states of SE have the form

$$\rho^X_{SE} = \frac{1}{4}\big(e^X_0 \mathbb{1}_S \otimes \mathbb{1}_E + e^X_j \sigma^j_S \otimes \mathbb{1}_E + e^X_{3+k} \mathbb{1}_S \otimes \sigma^k_E + e^X_{6+3(j-1)+k} \sigma^j_S \otimes \sigma^k_E\big),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} e^X_j &= e_j + T_{j,i} X_i = \Theta_{j,\mu} X_\mu, \\ e^X_{3+k} &= e_{3+k} + T_{3+k,i} X_i = \Theta_{3+k,\mu} X_\mu, \\ e^X_{6+3(j-1)+k} &= e_{6+3(j-1)+k} + T_{6+3(j-1)+k,i} X_i = \Theta_{6+3(j-1)+k,\mu} X_\mu. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

When projecting on to states of R and assuming that ρ_{RSE} is in the canonical form with $\rho_R = \mathbb{1}/2$, we have $e^X_0 = 1$. The reduced steering set of S obtained by tracing out E from ρ^X_{SE} has states of the form

$$\rho^X_S = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{1}_S + \Theta_{j,\mu} X_\mu \sigma^j_S).$$

The joint unitary evolution of S and E is represented in terms of its action on the operator basis furnished by the tensor products of Pauli operators (including the Identity operator, $\sigma_0 \equiv \mathbb{1}$) acting on each subsystem as

$$U\sigma_S^\mu \otimes \sigma_E^\nu U^\dagger = u_{\alpha\beta}^{\mu\nu}\sigma_S^\alpha \otimes \sigma_E^\beta, \quad \alpha,\beta,\mu,\nu = 0,\ldots,3.$$

The unitarity condition $U^\dagger U = UU^\dagger = \mathbb{1}$ means that $u_{00}^{\alpha\beta} = u_{\alpha,\beta}^{00} = \delta_{\alpha 0}\delta_{\beta 0}$. On application of the unitary, states in the steering set of SE are transformed to

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\rho}_{SE}^X = \frac{1}{4}\big(&\mathbb{1}_S \otimes \mathbb{1}_E + e_j^X u_{l\beta}^{j0}\sigma_S^l \otimes \sigma_E^\beta + e_j^X u_{0k}^{j0}\mathbb{1}_S \otimes \sigma_E^k + e_{3+k}^X u_{\alpha m}^{0k}\sigma_S^\alpha \otimes \sigma_E^m + e_{3+k}^X u_{l0}^{0k}\sigma_S^l \otimes \mathbb{1}_E \\ &+ e_{6+3(j-1)+k}^X u_{0m}^{jk}\mathbb{1}_S \otimes \sigma_E^m + e_{6+3(j-1)+k}^X u_{l0}^{jk}\sigma_S^l \otimes \mathbb{1}_E + e_{6+3(j-1)+k}^X u_{lm}^{jk}\sigma_S^l \otimes \sigma_E^m\big).\end{aligned}$$

Tracing out E from the state above (keeping only the terms with $\mathbb{1}_E = \sigma_E^0$), we obtain the states in the reduced steering set of S as

$$\widetilde{\rho}_S^X = \frac{1}{2}\big[\mathbb{1}_S + (e_l^X u_{j0}^{l0} + e_{3+k}^X u_{j0}^{0k} + e_{6+3(l-1)+k}^X u_{j0}^{lk})\sigma_S^j\big],$$

after exchanging the summed over indices j and l. Using Eq. (8), we can write the coefficient of σ_S^j in the above equation as $\widetilde{\Theta}_{j,\mu}X_\mu$ where,

$$\widetilde{\Theta}_{j,\mu} = u_{j0}^{l0}\Theta_{l,\mu} + u_{j0}^{0k}\Theta_{3+k,\mu} + u_{j0}^{lk}\Theta_{6+3(l-1)+k,\mu}.$$

So we have

$$\rho_S^X \to \widetilde{\rho}_S^X = \frac{1}{2}\big[\mathbb{1}_S + \widetilde{\Theta}_{j,\mu}X_\mu\sigma_S^j\big],$$

as required.

APPENDIX B: CONSTRUCTING THE B-MATRIX

In the first example, the starting point is a randomly generated state ρ_{RSE} with pairwise entanglement given by the concurrence values $\mathcal{C}_{RS} = 0.3677\,; \mathcal{C}_{RE} = 0.1102\,; \mathcal{C}_{SE} = 0$. To generate such a state, we start from a three qubit pure product state $\tau_{RSE} = |abc\rangle\langle abc|$, $a,b,c = 0,1$ and apply two unitary transformations as $\rho_{RSE} = U_{RE}[U_{RS}\tau_{RSE}U_{RS}^\dagger]U_{RE}^\dagger$. The first operation produces RS entanglement and the second one produces RE entanglement. However the two operations together can entangle SE also and so the state is passed through a controlled entanglement breaking channel to remove this entanglement. The state is brought to the canonical form in which $\rho_R = \mathbb{1}_R/2$ by the SLOCC operator $(2\rho_R)^{-1/2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{SE}$. Finally a post-selection on to states with the desired types of entanglement is also done. The state ρ_{RSE} could still have residual nonClassical correlations (as quantified by quantum Discord) between S and E but no entanglement. The Θ-matrix corresponding to the numerical density matrix ρ_{RSE} is generated and the first four elements of the vector $\vec{e}^X = \Theta X$ gives the reduced steering set of S. In this example, these states have density matrix components

$$\begin{aligned}(\rho_S^X)_{11} &= 0.1110 - 0.0230X_1 + 0.0585X_2 - 0.0883X_3 \\ (\rho_S^X)_{12} &= 0.1245 - 0.1025i + (0.01480 + 0.1878i)X_1 + (0.1882 - 0.0303i)X_2 + (0.0052 + 0.0344i)X_3 \\ (\rho_S^X)_{21} &= 0.1245 + 0.1025i + (0.01480 - 0.1878i)X_1 + (0.1882 + 0.0303i)X_2 + (0.0052 - 0.0344i)X_3 \\ (\rho_S^X)_{22} &= 0.8890 + 0.0230X_1 - 0.0585X_2 + 0.0883X_3\end{aligned}$$

Four linearly independent initial states belonging to the reduced steering set of S are generated by choosing the values $(1,0,0)$, $(-1,0,0)$, $(0,1,0)$ and $(0,0,1)$ for $\vec{X}$.

Applying the unitary $\mathbb{1}_R \otimes V_{SE}$, where $V_{SE} = \exp[2i(\sigma_2^S \otimes \sigma_2^E)]$ on ρ_{RSE} we get the transformed state $\widetilde{\rho}_{RSE}$ from which again the reduced steering states of S can be obtained using the same procedure as

$$\begin{aligned}(\widetilde{\rho}_S^X)_{11} &= 0.7020 + 0.0062X_1 - 0.07621X_2 + 0.1110X_3 \\ (\widetilde{\rho}_S^X)_{12} &= -0.0602 - 0.1025i + (0.0100 + 0.1878i)X_1 - (0.2541 + 0.0303i)X_2 - (0.0076 - 0.0344i)X_3 \\ (\widetilde{\rho}_S^X)_{21} &= -0.0602 + 0.1025i + (0.0100 - 0.1878i)X_1 - (0.2541 - 0.0303i)X_2 - (0.0076 + 0.0344i)X_3 \\ (\widetilde{\rho}_S^X)_{22} &= 0.2980 - 0.0062X_1 + 0.07621X_2 - 0.1110X_3\end{aligned}$$

The four transformed states corresponding to the initial linearly independent set can easily be obtained and these initial and final states allow us to find the 16 elements of the matrix A in $(\widetilde{\rho}_S^X)_{ij} = A_{ij;i'j'}(\rho_S^X)_{i'j'}$. Rearranging this matrix as $B_{ii';j'j} = A_{ij;i'j'}$ we obtain the B-matrix form of the map as

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} -0.4703 & -0.0096 + 0.0626i & 0.1879 & -0.1726 - 0.0840i \\ -0.0096 - 0.0626i & 0.8366 & -1.1726 + 0.0840i & 0.1166 \\ 0.1879 & -1.1726 - 0.0840i & 1.4703 & 0.0096 - 0.0626i \\ -0.1726 + 0.0840i & 0.1166 & 0.0096 + 0.0626i & 0.1633 \end{pmatrix}$$

The B-matrix has eigenvalues $(2.3838, 0.2288, -0.5704, -0.0422)$ with the negative eigenvalues indicating that the dynamical map is NCP.

The minimally parameterised initial state of *RSE* in the second example can be written out explicitly as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{RSE} = \frac{1}{8}\big(&\mathbb{1}_R \otimes \mathbb{1}_S \otimes \mathbb{1}_E + P\,\mathbb{1}_R \otimes \sigma_S^1 \otimes \mathbb{1}_E + P\,\mathbb{1}_R \otimes \sigma_S^3 \otimes \mathbb{1}_E + Q\,\mathbb{1}_R \otimes \mathbb{1}_S \otimes \sigma_E^2 \\ &+PQ\,\mathbb{1}_R \otimes \sigma_S^1 \otimes \sigma_E^2 + PQ\,\mathbb{1}_R \otimes \sigma_S^3 \otimes \sigma_E^2 \\ &+T\,\sigma_R^1 \otimes \sigma_S^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_E + T\,\sigma_R^2 \otimes \sigma_S^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_E + T\,\sigma_R^3 \otimes \sigma_S^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_E \\ &+T\,\sigma_R^1 \otimes \mathbb{1}_S \otimes \sigma_E^2 + T\,\sigma_R^2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_S \otimes \sigma_E^2 + T\,\sigma_R^3 \otimes \mathbb{1}_S \otimes \sigma_E^2 \\ &+T\,\sigma_R^1 \otimes \sigma_S^1 \otimes \sigma_E^2 + T\,\sigma_R^2 \otimes \sigma_S^1 \otimes \sigma_E^2 + T\,\sigma_R^3 \otimes \sigma_S^1 \otimes \sigma_E^2 \\ &+T\,\sigma_R^1 \otimes \sigma_S^3 \otimes \sigma_E^2 + T\,\sigma_R^2 \otimes \sigma_S^3 \otimes \sigma_E^2 + T\,\sigma_R^3 \otimes \sigma_S^3 \otimes \sigma_E^2\big). \end{aligned}$$

Applying $V_{SE} = \exp[i\omega(\sigma_S^2 \otimes \sigma_E^2)] = \cos(\omega) - i\sin(\omega)\sigma_S^2 \otimes \sigma_E^2$ to the state above is straightforward and the reduced steering states of S before and after the joint evolution with E are given by

$$\rho_S^X = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 1+P & P - iT|\vec{X}|_1 \\ P + iT|\vec{X}|_1 & 1-P \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\rho}_S^X = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 1 + P\cos(2\omega) - (PQ + T|\vec{X}|_1)\sin(2\omega) & (PQ + T|\vec{X}|_1)\sin(2\omega) + P\cos(2\omega) - iT|\vec{X}|_1 \\ (PQ + T|\vec{X}|_1)\sin(2\omega) + P\cos(2\omega) + iT|\vec{X}|_1 & 1 - P\cos(2\omega) + (PQ + T|\vec{X}|_1)\sin(2\omega) \end{pmatrix}$$

where $|\vec{X}|_1 \equiv X_1 + X_2 + X_3$. By inspection, we can find the A-matrix and from it the B-matrix as

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2(\omega) & -(Q+i)\cos(\omega)\sin(\omega) & 0 & \cos(\omega)[(Q+i)\sin(\omega) + \cos(\omega)] \\ -(Q-i)\cos(\omega)\sin(\omega) & \sin^2(\omega) & \sin(\omega)[(Q-i)\cos(\omega) - \sin(\omega)] & 0 \\ 0 & \sin(\omega)[(Q+i)\cos(\omega) - \sin(\omega)] & \sin^2(\omega) & (Q+i)\cos(\omega)\sin(\omega) \\ \cos(\omega)[(Q-i)\sin(\omega) + \cos(\omega)] & 0 & (Q-i)\cos(\omega)\sin(\omega) & \cos^2(\omega) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The eigenvalues, b_j, of the B-matrix are rather unwieldy expressions and so they are not written out here. A plot of the four eigenvalues of the B-Matrix for $Q = 0.2$ is shown below as a function of ω. We see that except for a few particular values of ω, the B-matrix is not positive and the open dynamics of S is NCP.



FIG. 4. The eigenvalues of the B-matrix, as a function of ω, for $Q = 0.2$, corresponding to the transformation of the reduced steering set of $\rho_{RSE}(P, Q, T)$ induced by the action of the unitary V_{SE} on the SE subsystem.

Stepping through the values of P, Q and T with a step size of 0.025 in the range $[-1, 1]$ for all three, we generated a scatter plot of the triplet $(I(R:E|S), \nu, B_{neg})$ for each state with the DPV violation parameter ν maximised over ω and included it in the main text. Projections of the scatter plot onto the three axes, taken pairwise, are given below in Fig. 5 for added clarity. We see a clear connection between the nonMarkov nature of the initial state and the degree of violation of the quantum DPI. However in the remaining two panels, we see that the negativity of the B-matrix seems inversely correlated with both $I(R:E|S)$ as well as ν. This is primarily because we are considering only a restricted set of unitary transformations on the SE system. The maximisation of the DPI in this case is only over ω and not over all possible unitary transformations of the SE subsystem. The fixed choice for the type of unitary transformation limits the scope of redistribution of the initial delocalised information during the course of the dynamics. The particular dynamics that brings maximum possible shared information between R and E into S is not the one that has the largest negativity of the reduced dynamics of S but it still is NCP in nature.



FIG. 5. Projections of the scatter plot given in the main text for $\rho_{RSE}(P, Q, T)$

In the third example, the maximisation of the quantum DPI violation is done over 3000 instances of randomly generated two qubit unitary matrices for each randomly generated state. The projections of the scatter plot in the main text are given in Fig. 6. Here we see that as the DPI violation increases and as the initial mutual information between R and E increases, the negativity of the B-matrix also rises on an average. Generation of the random initial states fails around thirty percent of the time to produce a state with the desired kinds of nonClassical correlations (only between RS and RE). The successful trials also fails less than one percent of the time because it leads to a reduced steering set in the Bloch sphere of states of S that is one or two dimensional. In these cases, the strategy of reconstructing the B-matrix by taking four linearly independent projectors on R to produce four linearly independent states in the reduced steering set of S fails. These failed trials are characterised by non-numerical or non-Hermitian B matrices based on which such trials are weeded out. Reduced steering sets that are very small also leads to numerical errors that typically lead to very large (order of 10^2) values for B_{neg}. These are also removed by limiting the range over which B_{neg} is plotted in the scatter plot in the main text and its projections.



FIG. 6. Projections of the scatter plot given in the main text for randomly generated states